

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as currently amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 18 are currently active in this case. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. See by way of non-limiting example page 6, line 10-page 8, line 13 of the Specification for support.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-7, 11-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oberhaus et al. and alternatively over Oberhaus et al. in view of Woo et al.

Briefly recapitulating, the present invention (claim 1) is directed to a portable message processing device distinct from devices used by a user for reading/writing messages (“read/write devices”) and which can be connected to different networks at different times by the user. The portable message processing device includes, among other things, a message collection unit configured to collect messages addressed to the user from message servers on behalf of the read/write devices using communication methods determined by a determination unit, and to store the messages into memory; and a message transmission unit configured to transmit the messages stored in the memory, in response to a request for reviewing the messages from another device. The other device is one of the read/write devices connected to a particular network by the user.

As a consequence of this configuration, the user, when he wants to read his messages, can connect to a network available at the location of the user using his portable messaging processing device. The user can manage all the messages in a unified way and read them anywhere using any read/write device available at the location of the user. That is, the present invention provides a portable message processing device which provides both a

portable and a unified way of handling and managing messages of a user. See page 2, line 22-26 of the Specification.

In contrast, Oberhaus merely discloses a system for synchronizing different electronic mail mailboxes of a user, such as one for a hand-held computing device and another for a desk-top computer (see col. 1, lines 35-41). Applicants point out that the hand-held computing device and the desk-top computer of Oberhaus are examples of the “other devices for viewing (displaying)” messages, and clearly do not constitute a portable message processing device as defined by claim 1. In fact, in Oberhaus, the mailboxes existing on different devices receive electronic messages independently, and then the electronic messages stored in these mailboxes on different devices are synchronized. See Figure 1 and col. 5, line 48-col.6, line 20 of Oberhaus.

Consequently, Oberhaus fails to disclose or suggest a portable message processing device which collects messages regardless of the location of the read/write devices. Thus, Oberhaus fails to realize a centralized management device for messages delivered from a plurality of message servers. That is, the Oberhaus device is incapable of realizing both portability and a unified way of handling and managing e-mails of a given user.

Moreover, the official action concedes that Oberhaus fails to disclose the claimed determination unit for determining communication methods for accessing the message servers. However, the official action asserts that this feature was known in the art at the time the invention was made, or alternatively that this feature is disclosed by Woo. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully point out that Oberhaus fails to teach many features of the present invention as discussed above in addition to failing to disclose a determination unit. Regarding the determination unit, Woo merely discloses a system including an e-mail server 102 and voice-mail server 104 which are provided on the same network 100. The system

enables users to access voice-mail received in the voice-mail system from the e-mail system and to access e-mail received in the e-mail system from the voice-mail system. Thus, even though Woo discloses a plurality of networks 510 and 520 in one embodiment as noted in section 14 of the Office Action, the essential teaching of Woo is still the same. That is, making both voice-mail and e-mail accessible from the voice-mail system and the e-mail system, respectively, where both systems are provided on the same network. See Fig. 1 and col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 8 of Woo.

Consequently, Woo fails to disclose any teaching or suggestion for determining communication methods for accessing a plurality of message servers distributed on a plurality of networks, collecting message addressed to the user from these message servers distributed on a plurality of networks on behalf of read/write devices, storing the collected message, or transmitting the stored message to one of the read/write devices on a particular network when the portable message processing device is currently connected in response to a request for viewing the messages from the read/write device.

In view of the foregoing, the rejection based on Oberhaus in view of Woo should be withdrawn, and claims 1-7 and 18 are believed to be condition for allowance.

An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

W. Todd Baker
Registration No. 45,265